

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are currently pending in this application. By this paper, independent claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended. In view of these amendments and the following remarks, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner disagree, Applicants request that the amendments be entered to put the claims in better condition for appeal.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 9 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner objected to the phrase "such as." By this paper, claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended to take out this phrase.

The present invention is directed to a removable cooling module for use in a reactor for carrying out an exothermic reaction. Normally, the reactor will contain a plurality of such cooling modules. The cooling modules are designed such that they can be removed from the charge pipe and the discharge pipe without the use of a cutting means so that they can be removed from the reactor for repair or replacement.

In the Office Action, independent claims 1, 9 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Savin et al. (4,060,127) in view of Kummel et al. (3,802,497). As discussed previously, the Savin et al. reference discloses a shell-and-tube heat exchanger. It does not disclose a removable cooling module for use in a reactor as required by claim 1 of the present application. Additionally, the claims as amended also require that the inlet and outlet be configured such that they can be disconnected without the use of a cutting means. Savin does not disclose a cooling module that can be disconnected from the inlet and outlet and removed without the use of a cutting means.

The Kummel et al. reference is directed to a heat exchanger for cooling gases. A plurality of heat exchangers are connected in parallel. This reference does not disclose a removable cooling module that can be used in a reactor. Further, Applicants submit that it does not teach nor suggest a method of modifying the Savin et al. reference to provide the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the remaining claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Savin and Kummel together or in combination with additional prior art.

Applicants submit that all of the dependent claims are patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and favorable consideration by the Examiner is requested. Should the Examiner find an impediment to the allowance of the case which could be corrected by telephone interview with the undersigned, the Examiner is requested to initiate such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

ANNE BOER and
FRANCISCUS J. M. SCHRAUWEN

P. O. Box 2463
Houston, Texas 77252-2463

By /Craig M. Lundell/
Their Attorney, Craig M. Lundell
Registration No. 30,284
(713) 241-2475